Some algebraic equivalent forms of $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$

Silvia Steila

Abstract

We study Σ^1_2 definable counterparts for some algebraic equivalent forms of the Continuum Hypothesis. All turn out to be equivalent to "all reals are constructible".

arXiv:1601.04433v1 [math.LO] 18 Jan 2016

1 Introduction

Sierpinski showed that the Continuum Hypothesis (CH) holds if and only if there are sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $A \cup B = \mathbb{R}^2$ and for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ the sections $A_a = \{y : (a, y) \in A\}$ and $B^b = \{x : (x, b) \in B\}$ are countable [9]. In [10, 11] Törnquist and Weiss studied many Σ^1_2 definable versions of some equivalent forms of CH which happen to be equivalent to "all reals are constructible". For instance, they proved the Σ^1_2 counterpart of Sierpinski's equivalence: $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$ if and only if there are Σ^1_2 sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $A_1 \cup A_2 = \mathbb{R}^2$ and for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ all sections $A_a = \{y : (a, y) \in A\}$ and $B^b = \{x : (x, b) \in B\}$ are countable.

We follow their scheme to get some algebraic forms of $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$. While Törnquist and Weiss considered Σ^2_1 statements of the form "there exist finitely many objects such that something happens", the first algebraic statements we analyze, namely the Σ^1_2 counterparts of Erdős and Kakutani's equivalence [1] and of Zoli's equivalence [12], require the existence of countably many objects.

Theorem 1.1. *The following are equivalent:*

1. $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$;
2. *there is a countable partition of* $\mathbb{R}$ *into* Σ^1_2*-uniformly definable subsets consisting only of rationally independent numbers;*
3. *the set of all transcendental reals is the union of countably many uniformly* Σ^1_2 *definable algebraically independent subsets.*

As side results, the proof we present for the Σ^1_2 definable versions provides a generalization of both the equivalences by Erdős-Kakutani and Zoli, where CH and "countably many" in the original theorems are replaced by $2^{\aleph_0} \leq \kappa^+$ and "κ-many".

Then we study the Σ^1_2 version of polynomial avoidance and Schmerl's results [8], by introducing a Σ^1_2 version of m-avoidance, for $m \in \omega$. As a corollary we obtain the Σ^1_2 counterpart of a theorem by Erdős and Komjáth [2]:

Theorem 1.2. $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$ *if and only if there exists a* Σ^1_2 *coloring of the plane in countably many colors with no monochromatic right-angled triangle.*

Plan of the paper. The main results are organized in three sections. In Section 3 we prove the first part of Theorem 1.1 (i.e. (1) iff (2)) and in Section 4 we prove the second part of Theorem 1.1 (i.e. (1) iff (3)). Schmerl's results and Theorem 1.2 are shown in Section 5. Each section starts with a short introduction and a generalization of the classical result, before presenting the definable counterpart.

2 Preliminaries

A set is Σ^1_2 if there exists a Σ^1_2 predicate which defines it, and a function is Σ^1_2 if its graph is. A set is Δ^1_2 if both it and its complement are Σ^1_2. Observe that all notions are intended lightface. For details we refer to [6].

Definition 2.1. A Δ^1_2 well-ordering $\prec$ is *strong* if it has length ω_1 and if for any $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}$ which is Σ^1_2,

$$\forall z \prec y P(x, z)$$

is Σ^1_2 as well.

For short we denote $x_\prec = \{z : z \prec x\}$. Given a Δ^1_2 strong well-ordering $\prec$, $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{<\omega}\times\mathbb{R}$ Σ^1_2 and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $\forall s \in (x_\prec)^{<\omega} P(s, y)$ is Σ^1_2. The existence of a Δ^1_2 strong well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ is equivalent to requiring that the initial segment relation $\mathrm{IS} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega}$ defined by

$$\mathrm{IS}(x, y) \iff \forall z(z \prec x \iff \exists n(y(n) = z)) \wedge \forall i, j(y(i) = y(j) \implies i = j),$$

is Δ^1_2. We also use the function $\mathrm{IS}^* : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega}$ which defines the initial segment of a given real:

$$\mathrm{IS}^*(x) = v \iff \mathrm{IS}(x, v) \wedge (\forall w \prec^* v)\neg\,\mathrm{IS}(x, w).$$

where $\prec^*$ is the product order in $\mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega}$ induced by $\prec$. If $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$ then there exists a Δ^1_2 strong well-ordering of reals which is the usual well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ in L (see e.g. [3]).

For short, let S be an equivalent form of CH. As shown by Törnquist and Weiss, proving that CH implies S can often be directly made into a proof of the effective implication, using the Δ^1_2 strong well-ordering of reals.

Vice versa, from a proof of "S implies CH" we cannot usually extract a proof of the effective implication. To this end, we need some properties of L, mainly a corollary of a theorem by Mansfield and Solovay: if a Σ^1_2 set contains a non-constructible real then it is uncountable. This result does not explicitly appear in this paper, since the use of the perfect set property is hidden in the proof of the Σ^1_2 version of two partition results, proved by Törnquist and Weiss, that we are going to apply. Both are Σ^1_2 counterparts of partition results by Komjáth and Totik [4].

Proposition 2.2 (Komjáth, Totik)**.**

1. *Let κ be an infinite cardinal, $|A| = \kappa^+$, $|B| = (\kappa^+)^+$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $f : A \times B \to \kappa$, then there exist $A' \subseteq A$, $B' \subseteq B$, $|A'| = |B'| = k$ such that $A' \times B'$ is monochromatic.*

2. *If $\neg CH$, then for any coloring $g : \mathbb{R} \to \omega$ there are distinct $x_{00}, x_{01}, x_{10}, x_{11} \in \mathbb{R}$ of the same color such that $x_{00} + x_{11} = x_{01} + x_{10}$.*

Proposition 2.3 (Törnquist, Weiss)**.**

1. *There is a non-constructible real if and only if for any $x \in \mathbb{R} \cap L$, for any $\Sigma^1_2(x)$ coloring $f : \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R} \to \omega$ and for any $k \in \omega$ there are C, $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that $|C| = |D| = k$ and $f \restriction C \times D$ is monochromatic.*

2. *There is a non-constructible real if and only if for any Σ^1_2 coloring $g : \mathbb{R} \to \omega$ there are four distinct $x_{00}, x_{01}, x_{10}, x_{11} \in \mathbb{R}$ of the same color such that $x_{00} + x_{11} = x_{01} + x_{10}$.*

We mainly work in $\mathbb{R}$, but sometimes we also work in different recursively presented Polish spaces, as $\mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega}$. This is not a problem in our setting, since between any two recursively presented Polish spaces there is a Δ^1_1 bijection.

3 Rationally independent sets

In [1] Erdős and Kakutani proved there is a close connection between CH and the existence of some special rationally independent subsets of reals. We prove a generalization of Erdős and Kakutani's equivalence. Recall that a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is rationally independent if for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1} \in X$ and for any $q_0, \ldots, q_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}$ we have:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} q_i x_i \neq 0.$$

First of all, following Komjáth and Totik, we get a straightforward generalization of Proposition 2.2.2.

Proposition 3.1. *If $2^{\aleph_0} \geq (\kappa^+)^+$, then for any coloring $g : \mathbb{R} \to \kappa$ there are distinct $x_{00}, x_{01}, x_{10}, x_{11} \in \mathbb{R}$ of the same color such that $x_{00} + x_{11} = x_{01} + x_{10}$.*

Proof. Assume that $2^{\aleph_0} \geq (\kappa^+)^+$ and consider any $g : \mathbb{R} \to \kappa$. Take an injection $i : (\kappa^+)^+ \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and define $i' : (\kappa^+)^+ \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathrm{ran}(i')$ is rationally independent. Put $i'(\alpha) = i(\beta)$ for $\beta = \mu\gamma \in (\kappa^+)^+ (\forall s \in (\mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\})^{<\omega} \forall t \in \gamma^{<\omega} (\mathrm{dom}(s) = \mathrm{dom}(t) \implies \sum_{j=0}^{dom(s)} s(j) i(t(j)) \neq i(\gamma)))$. Let

$$\left\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa^+\right\} \cup \left\{b_\beta : \beta < (\kappa^+)^+\right\}$$

be a rationally independent set, and define the following coloring:

$$\begin{array}{rccc} f: & \kappa^+ \times (\kappa^+)^+ & \longrightarrow & \kappa \\ & (\alpha, \beta) & \longmapsto & g(a_\alpha + b_\beta) \end{array}$$

Thanks to Proposition 2.2.1 there exist $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 \in \kappa^+$ and $\beta_0, \beta_1 \in (\kappa^+)^+$ such that $\{\alpha_0, \alpha_1\} \times \{\beta_0, \beta_1\}$ is monochromatic. Define $x_{ij} = \alpha_i + \beta_j$ for any $i, j \in 2$. They are distinct and they satisfy $x_{00} + x_{11} = x_{01} + x_{10}$. □

Recall that $H \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is a Hamel basis if both H is rationally independent and H is a basis of $\mathbb{R}$ over $\mathbb{Q}$.

Theorem 3.2. *We have $2^{\aleph_0} \leq \kappa^+$ if and only if $\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$ can be covered by κ-many rationally independent sets.*

Proof. "⇒". Assume that $2^{\aleph_0} \leq \kappa^+$, and let H be a Hamel basis for $\mathbb{R}$. Take an injection $f : \mathbb{R} \hookrightarrow \kappa^+$ and define the order $\lhd$ of length $\leq \kappa^+$ of $\mathbb{R}$ by $x \lhd y$ if and only if $f(x) < f(y)$. For any natural number $n > 0$ and for any $s \in (\mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\})^n$, define

$$s \cdot H^n = \left\{ x : \exists h_0 \lhd \cdots \lhd h_{n-1} \in H \left(x = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} s(i) h_i \right) \right\}. \tag{1}$$

First notice that as H is a Hamel basis, $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ is covered by all sets $s \cdot H^n$ for $s \in (\mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\})^n$. So it suffices to show the result for all sets $s \cdot H^n$. From now on fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \in (\mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\})^n$. Note if $n = 1$ as H is rationally independent the result is trivial, so assume that $n > 1$.

Given $x \in s \cdot H^n$, define $\mathrm{last}(x)$ as the greatest element of H which appears in (1) (i.e. h_{n-1}). For any $h \in H$ define

$$s \cdot (H^{n-1} h) = \{ x \in s \cdot H^n : \mathrm{last}(x) = h \}.$$

Given $h \in H$ let $\gamma_h = |s \cdot (H^{n-1}h)|$. Observe that $\gamma_h \leq \kappa$ since $|H| = \kappa^+$. Therefore for any $h \in H$ we can fix an enumeration:

$$s \cdot (H^{n-1}h) = \left\{ x^h_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma_h \right\}.$$

Finally, for any $\alpha < \kappa$ let $S_{s,\alpha}$ be the set of α-th elements of any $s \cdot (H^{n-1}h)$ for $h \in H$; i.e.

$$S_{s,\alpha} = \left\{ x^h_\alpha : h \in H \wedge \alpha < \gamma_h \right\}.$$

Therefore we have

$$\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} = \bigcup \left\{ S_{s,\alpha} : s \in (\mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\})^{<\omega} \wedge \alpha < \kappa \right\}.$$

We claim that for any $\alpha < \kappa$, $S_{s,\alpha}$ is rationally independent. Indeed, assume by contradiction that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k} p_i x_i = 0, \tag{2}$$

where for any $i \in k+1$:

- $x_i \in S_{s,\alpha}$;
- for any $j \in k+1$, $x_i \neq x_j$;
- p_i is a not null integer.

By construction, for any two distinct elements $x_1, x_2 \in S_{s,\alpha}$, $\mathrm{last}(x_1) \neq \mathrm{last}(x_2)$. Then there would exist an integer $i_0 \in k+1$ for which $\mathrm{last}(x_{i_0}) > \mathrm{last}(x_i)$ for any $i \in k+1 \setminus \{i_0\}$. Hence in the expansion (1) of all x_i, $\mathrm{last}(x_{i_0})$ would appear only once, which is impossible because of (2) and H rationally independent.

"$\Leftarrow$." Let $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} = \bigcup \{S_\alpha : \alpha \in \kappa\}$, where each S_α is a rationally independent set. Assume by contradiction that $2^{\aleph_0} > \kappa^+$ and define $g : \mathbb{R} \to \kappa$ such that $g(0) = 0$ and for any $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$

$$g(x) = \alpha + 1 \iff x \in S_\alpha \wedge \forall \beta < \alpha (x \notin S_\beta).$$

Applying Proposition 3.1 we get x_{00}, x_{10}, x_{01}, $x_{11} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ such that x_{00}, x_{10}, x_{01}, $x_{11} \in S_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \kappa$ which are rationally dependent. Contradiction. □

The proof of the first implication follows the one by Erdős and Kakutani's result, while the argument for the vice versa, as far as we know, is new. The original proof uses a tree argument, which cannot be easily adapted to the Σ^1_2 version.

Remark 3.3. Note that in the proof of Theorem 3.2 the subsets $S_{s,\alpha}$, for $s \in (\mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\})^{<\omega}$ and $\alpha \in \kappa$, are disjoint.

3.1 Definable counterpart

We prove that $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$ holds if and only if $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ can be decomposed in countably many rationally independent subsets of reals which are uniformly definable by a Σ^1_2 predicate. The proof follows very closely the one of Theorem 3.2: we need only to check that if there is a Δ^1_2-strong well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ then the sets provided by Erdős and Kakutani's argument are uniformly Σ^1_2. For the opposite implication we apply Proposition 2.3.2, the Σ^1_2 counterpart of Proposition 3.1.

As a first step we considered a Hamel basis for $\mathbb{R}$. In [5] Miller proved that if $V = L$ then there is a Π^1_1 Hamel basis. For our goal it is sufficient to provide a Δ^1_2 one, under the condition $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$. The proof is straightforward and it should be well-known. However, since we have not found any reference for this proof, we show the argument.

Lemma 3.4. *If $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$ then there exists a Δ^1_2 Hamel basis for $\mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Let $\prec$ be a Δ^1_2-strong well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$. Define

$$h \in H \iff \forall s \in (h_\prec)^{<\omega}\ \forall t \in (\mathbb{Q}\setminus\{0\})^{<\omega}(\mathrm{dom}(s) = \mathrm{dom}(t) \implies h \neq \sum_{i=0}^{\mathrm{dom}(s)} t(i)s(i)).$$

By definition H is rationally independent. We prove that H generates $\mathbb{R}$. Take $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and prove that there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h_0, \dots, h_{n-1} \in H$ and $q_0, \dots, q_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $x = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} q_i h_i$. Proceed by induction on $\prec$. If x has no $\prec$-predecessors then it belongs to H. Assume that the assertion holds for any y such that $y \prec x$. If $x \in H$ we are done. Otherwise there exist some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_0 \prec \cdots \prec x_{n-1} \prec x$ and $q_0, \dots, q_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Q}\setminus\{0\}$ such that $x = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} q_i x_i$. As all x_i are generated by H, so is x. □

Theorem 3.5. *$\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$ if and only if there is a countable decomposition of $\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$ into Σ^1_2-uniformly definable subsets consisting only of rationally independent numbers.*

Proof. "⇒". Assume that $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$, and let H be a Δ^1_2 Hamel basis for $\mathbb{R}$, which exists thanks to Lemma 3.4. For any natural number n, for any sequence $s \in (\mathbb{Q}\setminus\{0\})^n$ and for any $h \in H$ define $s \cdot H^n$ and $s \cdot (H^{n-1}h)$ as in the proof of Theorem 3.2. Then

$$\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\} = \bigsqcup \left\{ s \cdot H^{n-1} : n \in \omega, s \in (\mathbb{Q}\setminus\{0\})^n \right\}.$$

As observed in Remark 3.3 this is a disjoint union. Fix a natural number n and a sequence $s \in (\mathbb{Q}\setminus\{0\})^n$. We want to define countably many disjoint subsets of $s \cdot H^n$ such that each one contains at most one element of $s \cdot (H^{n-1}h)$ for any $h \in H$. To this end, given an increasing finite sequence of natural numbers $t \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$, define $S_{s,t}$ to be the subset of $s \cdot H^n$ which consists of elements of the form $x = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} s(i)h_i$ for some $h_0 \prec \cdots \prec h_{n-1} \in H$ such that for any $i \in n-1$, h_i is the $t(i)$-th predecessor of h_{n-1}. Therefore

$$S_{s,t} = \{x : \exists h \in H \exists v \in \mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega}(\mathrm{IS}^*(h) = v \wedge \forall i \in n-1(v(t(i)) \in H) \wedge x = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} s(i)v(t(i)) + s(n-1)h)\}.$$

By construction $\mathrm{last}(x_1) \neq \mathrm{last}(x_2)$ for any $x_1,\ x_2 \in S_{s,t}$ such that $x_1 \neq x_2$. Moreover we have $s \cdot H^n = \bigsqcup \{S_{s,t} : t \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}\}$. The sets $S_{s,t}$, where $s \in \mathbb{Q}^{<\omega}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}^{<\omega}$, are uniformly definable by the following Σ^1_2 formula.

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(x,n,s,t) \iff\ & s \in \mathbb{Q}^{<\omega} \wedge t \in \mathbb{N}^{<\omega} \wedge \mathrm{dom}(s) = n \wedge \mathrm{dom}(t) = n-1 \\ & \wedge \forall i \in n-2(t(i) < t(i+1)) \wedge \exists h \exists v \in \mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega}\Big[h \in H \wedge \mathrm{IS}^*(h) = v \\ & \wedge \forall i \in n-1(v(t(i)) \in H) \wedge x = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} s(i)v(t(i)) + s(n-1)h\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Notice to conclude that rationally independence of the set $S_{s,t}$ holds with the same argument of Theorem 3.2.

"⇐". Let $\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\} = \bigsqcup\{S_i : i \in \omega\}$, where S_i are uniformly Σ^1_2 definable rationally independent sets. Let define $g : \mathbb{R} \to \omega$ such that $g(0) = 0$ and for any $x \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$

$$g(x) = i+1 \iff x \in S_i.$$

Since by hypothesis the S_i are uniformly definable by a Σ^1_2 formula, g is Σ^1_2. Suppose by contradiction that $\mathbb{R} \not\subseteq L$, then by applying Proposition 2.3.2 there exist $x_{00}, x_{01}, x_{10}, x_{11} \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$ such that $x_{00}, x_{01}, x_{10}, x_{11} \in S_i$ for some $i \in \omega$ and $x_{00} + x_{11} = x_{01} + x_{10}$. So there are four distinct elements of S_i which are rationally dependent. Contradiction. □

4 Algebraically independent sets

Zoli in [12] proved a connection between CH and the existence of a decomposition of transcendental reals in algebraically independent sets. We provide a generalization of Zoli's result.

Given two fields $K_1 \subseteq K_2$, we say that $x \in K_2$ is algebraic over K_1 if there exists a polynomial p in $K_1[X]$ (not null) such that $p(x) = 0$. If $x \in K_2$ is not algebraic over K_1, then it is called transcendental over K_1. We denote by $\operatorname{alg}_{K_2} K_1$ the subfield of K_2 consisting of algebraic elements over K_1. Given $x \in K_2$, $K_1(x)$ is the field extension generated by x. $S \subseteq K_2$ is algebraically dependent over K_1 if there exist $x_0, \ldots, x_n \in S$ such that x_n is algebraic over $K_1(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$. A transcendence basis T is a subset of reals which is algebraically independent over $\mathbb{Q}$ and maximal.

Lemma 4.1 (Folklore)**.** *Let $K_1 \subseteq K_2$ be a field extension.*

- *Let $S \subseteq K_2$. If $x \in \operatorname{alg}_{K_2} K_1(S) \setminus \operatorname{alg}_{K_2} K_1$, then S is algebraically independent over $K_1(x)$.*
- *Let T be a transcendence basis for K_2 over K_1. To each $x \in K_2$ there corresponds a unique minimal (finite) subset S of T such that $x \in \operatorname{alg}_{K_2} K_1(S)$.*

For a proof we refer to [12].

Theorem 4.2. *We have $2^{\aleph_0} \leq \kappa^+$ if and only if the set of all transcendental reals is union of κ-many algebraically independent sets.*

Proof. "⇒". Assume that $2^{\aleph_0} \leq \kappa^+$, and let T be a transcendence basis. Fix $f : \mathbb{R} \hookrightarrow \kappa^+$ and define a well ordering of length κ^+ of reals: $x \lhd y$ if and only if $f(x) < f(y)$. By Lemma 4.1 each $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})$ corresponds to a unique $n(x) \in \omega$ and a sequence $t_0(x) < \cdots < t_{n(x)}(x) \in T$ such that

$$x \in \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Q}(t_0(x), \ldots, t_{n(x)}(x)) \setminus \bigcup_{i \in n(x)+1} \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Q}(T \setminus \{t_i(x)\}). \tag{3}$$

For any $n \in \omega$, define the set $\overline{T}_n$ of all transcendental numbers for which the cardinality of the minimum subset provided by Lemma 4.1 is $n + 1$; i.e.

$$\overline{T}_n = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q}) : n(x) = n\}.$$

Thus $\mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q}) = \bigcup \left\{\overline{T}_n : n \in \omega\right\}$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ define $\overline{T}_{n,t}$ as:

$$\overline{T}_{n,t} = \{x : x \in \overline{T}_n \wedge t_n(x) = t\}.$$

Notice that T has cardinality κ^+ and therefore $\overline{T}_{n,t}$ has cardinality at most κ. Hence fix an enumeration $\overline{T}_{n,t} = \{x^{n,t}_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ and define

$$S_\alpha = \{x^{n,t}_\alpha : n \in \omega \wedge t \in T\},$$

Observe that $\mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})$ is covered by all sets S_α for $\alpha \in \kappa$. In order to complete this proof we have to show that any set S_α is algebraically independent. Fix $\alpha \in \kappa$ in order to prove that any $x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1} \in S_\alpha$ are algebraically independent. We prove it by induction over k.

Assume that $k = 0$, then since $S_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})$ we are done. Now assume that it holds for k and prove it for $k + 1$. Therefore consider $x_0, \ldots, x_k \in S_\alpha$. By construction, for any two elements of S_α we have $t_n(x) \neq t_n(y)$. Thus without loss of generality we can assume that $t_n(x_k) > t_n(x_i)$ for any $i \in k$. Assume by contradiction that there exists $i \in k + 1$ such that $x_i \in \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Q}(x_0, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_k)$. There are two cases.

- If $i = k$. Therefore

$$x_k \in \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Q}(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) \subseteq \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Q}(\{t_i(x_j) : i \in n, j \in k\}) \subseteq \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Q}(T \setminus \{t_n(x_k)\}).$$

  This is a contradiction with (3).

- If $i \neq k$. By inductive hypothesis the set $\{x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}\}$ is algebraically independent, therefore it must exist

$$q \in \mathbb{Q}[X_0, \dots, X_k] \setminus \mathbb{Q}[X_0, \dots X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_{k-1}]$$

  such that $q(x_0, \dots, x_k) = 0$. But this yields that $x_k \in \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Q}(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1})$ and this is impossible as proved in the previous case.

"$\Leftarrow$". Apply Theorem 3.2, since any algebraically independent subset is rationally independent. □

Note that the algebraically independent sets provided in the proofs from $2^{\aleph_0} \geq \kappa^+$ are disjoint. In Theorem 4.2, as in Zoli's original argument, we proved that the transcendental reals are a disjoint union of κ-many algebraically independent sets. However, since any algebraically independent set is contained in some transcendence basis, we obtain the following.

Corollary 4.3. *$2^{\aleph_0} \leq \kappa^+$ if and only if the set of all transcendental reals is union of κ-many transcendence bases for $\mathbb{R}$.*

4.1 Definable counterpart

The first step we need to show that if all reals are constructible, then there is a Δ^1_2 transcendence basis.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume that $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$.*

1. *For any $y_0, \dots, y_n \in \mathbb{R}$, $\operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Q}(y_0, \dots y_n)$ is Σ^1_1.*
2. *There exists a Δ^1_2 transcendence basis.*

Proof. Let $\prec$ be a Δ^1_2-strong well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$.

1. By definition $x \in \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Q}(y_0, \dots, y_n)$ if and only if

$$\exists (x_0, \dots, x_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{<\omega} (x_0, \dots, x_m \in \mathbb{Q}(y_0, \dots, y_n) \wedge x_0 + x_1 x + \dots + x_m x^m = 0).$$

   The assertion follows by induction over n, since $x \in \mathbb{Q}(y_0, \dots, y_n)$ if and only if

$$\exists (a_0, \dots, a_h, b_0, \dots, b_k) \in \mathbb{Q}(y_0, \dots, y_{n-1})^{<\omega} (x = \frac{a_0 + \dots + a_h y_n^h}{b_0 + \dots + b_k y_n^k}).$$

2. Define

$$x \in T \iff x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q}) \wedge \forall (x_0, \dots, x_n) \in (x_{\prec})^{<\omega} (x \notin \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Q}(x_0, \dots, x_n)).$$

   We claim that T is a transcendence basis for $\mathbb{R}$. T is algebraically independent by definition. Moreover $\mathbb{R}$ is algebraic over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$. Indeed we show that for any

$x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})$ there exist $x_0, \dots, x_n \in T$ such that $x \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}\,\mathbb{Q}(x_0, \dots, x_n)$. By induction on $\prec$. Let $x_0 = \min_{\prec}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q}))$, then by definition $x_0 \in T$. Assume that $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})$ and that for any $y \prec x$ the assertion holds. We have two possibilities: either $x \in T$ or there exists some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\exists x_0, \dots, x_n \prec x (x \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}\,\mathbb{Q}(x_0, \dots, x_n))$. Both in the first case and whether in the second one $x_0, \dots, x_n \in T$ we have the assertion. Then assume that we are in the second case and $x_0, \dots, x_n \notin T$. As all x_i are algebraic over T, then also x is. □

Theorem 4.5. *$\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$ if and only if the set of all transcendental reals is the disjoint union of countably many algebraically independent sets uniformly definable by a Σ^1_2 predicate.*

Proof. "⇒". Assume that $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$, then by Lemma 4.4 there exists T which is a Δ^1_2 transcendence basis. For any $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})$ and any $n \in \omega$ define $n(x)$, $t_i(x)$ and $\overline{T}_n$ as in the proof of Theorem 4.2. Fix a natural number n. We define countably many disjoint subsets of $\overline{T}_n$ which contain at most one element of $\overline{T}_{n,t}$ for any $t \in T$. To this end fix $t_0, \dots, t_{n-1} \prec t$. For any $x \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}\,\mathbb{Q}(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}, t)$ there exists a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Q}[X_0, \dots, X_n, X]$ such that $p(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}, t, x) = 0$. Thus for any $p \in \mathbb{Q}[X_0, \dots, X_n, X]$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ define

$$\overline{T}_{n,t,p,v} = \{x : x \in S_n \wedge \forall i \in n(v(i) = t_i(x)) \wedge t = t_n(x) \wedge p(t_0(x), \dots, t_n(x), x) = 0\}.$$

Observe that $\overline{T}_{n,t,p,v}$ is uniformly Δ^1_2 definable by the following formula.

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(x,t,n,p,v) = {} & x \notin \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q}) \wedge \mathrm{dom}(v) = n \wedge x \notin \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}\,\mathbb{Q}(\{v(j) : j \in n\}) \\ & \wedge \forall i \in n(x \notin \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}\,\mathbb{Q}(\{v(j) : j \in n, j \neq i\} \cup \{t\})) \wedge p(v(0), \dots, v(n-1), t, x) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Up to now the sets $\overline{T}_{n,t,p,v}$ are not disjoint, since any x belongs to $\overline{T}_{n,t,p,v}$ for several polynomials p. However since $p \in \mathbb{Q}[X_0, \dots, X_n, X]$, it can be coded with a natural number by a Δ^1_1 map $m : \mathbb{Q}^{<\omega} \to \mathbb{N}$. Therefore we can define a Δ^1_2 formula which provides a partition of $\overline{T}_n$, by choosing the polynomial with the minimal code:

$$\varphi^*(x,t,n,p,v) = \varphi(x,t,n,p,v) \wedge \forall q \in \mathbb{Q}^{<\omega}(m(q) < m(p) \implies \neg\varphi(x,t,n,q,v)).$$

Put $\overline{T}^*_{n,t,p,v} = \{x : \varphi^*(x,t,n,p,v)\}$. Since $p(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}, t, X) \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$, it has finitely many roots. Given a root x, let l be the number roots which are smaller than x with respect to $\prec$. Hence there is a 1-1 correspondence between $\overline{T}_{n,t}$ and the set of tuples $(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}, p, l)$ for some $t_0, \dots, t_{n-1} \prec t$, $p \in \mathbb{Q}[X_0, \dots, X_n, X]$ and $l \leq \deg(p(v(0), \dots, v(n-1), t, X))$.

For any $n, l \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \in \mathbb{Q}[X_0, \dots, X_n, X]$ and for any increasing finite sequence of natural numbers $s \in \mathbb{N}^{<\omega}$ define

$$\begin{aligned}S_{n,p,s,l} = \{x : \exists w \in \mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega} \exists v \in \mathbb{R}^n (\mathrm{IS}^*(t_n(x)) = w \wedge \forall i \in n(v(i) = w(s(i))) \\ \wedge x \in \overline{T}^*_{n,t_n(x),p,v} \wedge |\{y : y \prec x\} \cap \overline{T}^*_{n,t_n(x),p,v}| = l)\},\end{aligned}$$

By construction $x, y \in S_{n,p,s,l}$ and $t_n(x) = t_n(y)$ yield $x = y$. Moreover $S_{n,p,s,l}$ can be uniformly defined by the following Σ^1_2 formula.

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(x,n,p,s,l) \iff {} & \exists t \in \mathbb{R} \exists w \in \mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega} \exists v \in \mathbb{R}^{<\omega} (\mathrm{IS}^*(t) = w \wedge \forall i \in n(w(s(i)) = v(i)) \\ & \wedge \varphi(x,t,n,p,v) \wedge \exists u \in \mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega} [\mathrm{IS}^*(x) = u \wedge \mathrm{dom}(u) \geq l \wedge (\exists s' \in \mathbb{N}^l \\ & (\forall i \in l-1 (s'(i) < s'(i+1)) \wedge \forall i \in l \varphi(u(s'(i)), t, n, p, v)) \wedge (\mathrm{dom}(u) > l \\ & \implies \forall s' \in \mathbb{N}^{l+1} (\exists i \in l (s'(i) \geq s'(i+1)) \vee \exists i \in l+1 \neg\varphi(u(s'(i)), t, n, p, v))))].\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q}) = \bigsqcup \{S_{n,p,s,l} : n, l \in \mathbb{N}, s \in \mathbb{N}^{<\omega}, p \in \mathbb{Q}[X_0, \ldots, X_n, X]\}.$$

In order to complete this proof we have to show that any set $S_{n,p,s,l}$ is algebraically independent. Since, by construction for any two elements $x, y \in S_{n,p,s,l}$, $t_n(x) \neq t_n(y)$, the argument is exactly the one shown in Theorem 4.2.

"$\Leftarrow$". Since any algebraically independent subset is rationally independent, the assertion follows by Theorem 3.5, □

In his work Zoli proved that CH holds if and only if the set of all transcendental reals is the disjoint union of countably many algebraically independent sets S_i. Corollary 4.3 follows since if S_i is algebraically independent then we can define a transcendence basis T_i which contains S_i as follows:

$$x \in T_i \iff x \in S_i \vee (x \notin \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Q}(S_i) \wedge \forall y_0, \ldots, y_n \prec x (x \notin \operatorname{alg}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Q}(S_i \cup \{y_0, \ldots, y_n\}))).$$

However this basis is Π^1_2 and up to now we did not find a Σ^1_2 formula which defines it. Therefore our definable version of Zoli's result deal with algebraically independent sets and not with transcendence bases.

5 Polynomial avoidance

We present some results by Schmerl [8] about polynomial avoidance and an equivalence by Erdős and Komjáth [2] in order to obtain the correspondent Σ^1_2 definable counterparts.

We say that a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}[X_0, \ldots, X_{k-1}]$ is a (k, n)-*ary polynomial* if every X_i is a n-tuple of variables. Given a (k, n)-ary polynomial $p(x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1})$, a coloring $\chi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \omega$ *avoids* it if for any $r_0, \ldots, r_{k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ distinct and monochromatic with respect to χ, $p(r_0, \ldots, r_{k-1}) \neq 0$. Moreover the polynomial $p(x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1})$ is *avoidable* if there exists a coloring which avoids it.

Definition 5.1 (Schmerl)**.** Let $m \in \omega$ and $k \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}$.

- A function $\alpha : A_0 \times A_1 \times \cdots \times A_{m-1} \to B_0 \times B_1 \times \cdots \times B_{m-1}$ is *coordinately induced* if for every $i \in m$ there is a function $\alpha_i : A_i \to B_i$ such that

$$\alpha(a_0, \ldots, a_{m-1}) = (\alpha_0(a_0), \ldots, \alpha_{m-1}(a_{m-1})).$$

- A function $g : A^m \to B$ is *one-one in each coordinate* if whenever $a_0, \ldots, a_{m-1}, b \in A$ and $b \neq a_i$ for some $i \in m$, then

$$g(a_0, \ldots a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_{m-1}) \neq g(a_0, \ldots, a_{i-1}, b, a_{i+1}, \ldots a_{m-1}).$$

- Assume that $p(x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1})$ is a (k, n)-ary polynomial. For each $m \in \omega$ we say that $p(x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1})$ is m-*avoidable* if for each definable function $g : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^n$ which is one-one in each coordinate and for distinct $e_0, \ldots, e_{k-1} \in (0, 1)^m$ there is a coordinately induced $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $p(g\alpha(e_0), \ldots, g\alpha(e_{k-1})) \neq 0$.

Instead of $\mathbb{R}^m$ we can use also $(0, 1)^m$, $(a, b)^m$ or any open m-box, since there is a Δ^1_1 bijection between them.

Theorem 5.2 (Schmerl)**.**

1. *If CH does not hold then every avoidable polynomial is* 2*-avoidable.*
2. *If CH holds then every* 1*-avoidable polynomial is avoidable.*

5.1 Schmerl's equivalences

In fact the statements studied by Schmerl are equivalences respectively with ¬CH and CH. To show it we need to recall Erdős-Komjáth's equivalence. Erdős and Komjáth proved that CH holds if and only if the plane can be colored with countably many colors with no monochromatic right-angled triangle, where a right-angled triangle is monochromatic if its vertices are.

Notation 5.3. Let $\tilde{p}(x_0, x_1, x_2)$ be the following $(3, 2)$-ary polynomial:

$$\tilde{p}(x_0, x_1, x_2) = \|x_1 - x_0\|^2 + \|x_2 - x_0\|^2 - \|x_1 - x_2\|^2.$$

Observe that given distinct $a_0, a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\tilde{p}(a_0, a_1, a_2) = 0$ if and only if a_0, a_1 and a_2 form a right-angled triangle. Hence

Theorem 5.4 (Erdős, Komjáth)**.** *CH holds if and only if $\tilde{p}(x_0, x_1, x_2)$ is avoidable.*

In [8], Schmerl also proved that $\tilde{p}(x_0, x_1, x_2)$ is 1-avoidable and it is not 2-avoidable. Since this result is crucial to prove our goal, let us recall the proof.

Lemma 5.5 (Schmerl)**.** *The $(3, 2)$-ary polynomial $\tilde{p}(x_0, x_1, x_2)$ is 1-avoidable and it is not 2-avoidable.*

Proof. First of all we prove that it is 1-avoidable. Indeed given $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ and $e_0 \neq e_1 \neq e_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ define $\alpha : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\alpha(x) = y \iff (x = e_2 \wedge y = e_1) \vee (x \neq e_2 \wedge y = x).$$

Hence $\alpha(e_0) = e_0$, $\alpha(e_1) = e_1$ and $\alpha(e_2) = e_1$, therefore $g(\alpha(e_0)) \neq g(\alpha(e_1)) = g(\alpha(e_2))$ since g is one-one in each coordinate. This yields $p(g(\alpha(e_0)), g(\alpha(e_1)), g(\alpha(e_2))) \neq 0$.

To prove that it is not 2-avoidable let $g : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be the identity function and put $e_0 = (0, 0)$, $e_1 = (1, 0)$ and $e_2 = (0, 1)$. They form a right-angled triangle. Let $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be any coordinately induced function, hence $\alpha(e_0)$, $\alpha(e_1)$ and $\alpha(e_2)$ form a right-angled triangle, eventually degenerate. So

$$\tilde{p}(g(\alpha(e_0)), g(\alpha(e_1)), g(\alpha(e_2))) = \tilde{p}(\alpha(e_0), \alpha(e_1), \alpha(e_2)) = 0. \qquad \square$$

Proposition 5.6.

1. *If any avoidable polynomial is 2-avoidable then ¬CH holds.*
2. *If any 1-avoidable polynomial is avoidable then CH holds.*

Proof.

1. Assume that CH holds, then by Erdős and Komjáth's equivalence $\tilde{p}(x_0, x_1, x_2)$ is avoidable. Then, by hypothesis it is 2-avoidable. Contradiction by Lemma 5.5.
2. By Lemma 5.5, $\tilde{p}(x_0, x_1, x_2)$ is 1-avoidable. Then, by hypothesis, it is avoidable. Therefore, again by Erdős-Komjáth equivalence, CH holds. $\square$

5.2 Auxiliary results

Recall that our goal is to provide Σ^1_2 definable counterparts for both the results by Schmerl and Erdős and Komjáth's equivalence. To this end we need some technical facts. The first one is the Σ^1_2 version of a lemma used to prove Theorem 5.2.2.

Lemma 5.7. *Assume that $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$, then there is a Σ^1_2 function $G : \mathbb{R}^{<\omega} \to \omega$ such that whenever $a,\ b \in \mathbb{R}^{<\omega}$*

- *if $G(a) = G(b)$ then $|a| = |b|$;*
- *if $G(a) = G(b)$ and $\max(a) = \max(b)$ then $a = b$.*

Proof. Let $i : \omega^{<\omega} \to \omega$ be any Σ^1_2 injection. For each $x \in \mathbb{R}$, let $F_x : x \to \omega$ be the Σ^1_2 injection defined by:

$$F_x(y) = n \iff \exists v \in \mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega}(\mathrm{IS}^*(x) = v \wedge v(n) = y).$$

By definition $F_x(y) = n$ holds if y is the n-th predecessor of x. Then consider $a \in \mathbb{R}^{<\omega}$. If $a = \emptyset$ put $G(a) = 0$ otherwise let $x = \max a$, $G(a) = i(F_x[a \setminus \{x\}])$. □

The second fact we need is the following lemma, for the proof we refer to [7].

Lemma 5.8 (Schmerl)**.** *Let T be a transcendence basis for $\mathbb{R}$ over $\mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})$. Let l be a natural number, $q_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ for any $i \in 2l$, $D = (q_0, q_1) \times \cdots \times (q_{2l-2}, q_{2l-1})$ and let $h : D^k \to \mathbb{R}$ be an $\mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})$-definable analytical function. Suppose that for any $j \in k$, $\bar{t}_j = (t_{0,j}, \ldots, t_{l-1,j}) \in T^l \cap D$ and $h(\bar{t}_0, \ldots, \bar{t}_{k-1}) = 0$. If $\beta : \{t_{i,j} : i \in l, j \in k\} \to \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\beta'' \bar{t}_j = (\beta(t_{0,j}), \ldots, \beta(t_{l-1,j})) \in D$ for any $j \in k$, then $h(\beta'' \bar{t}_0, \ldots, \beta'' \bar{t}_{k-1}) = 0$.*

The coloring which witnesses the Σ^1_2-avoidance of the given polynomial in the original proof of Theorem 5.2.2 is defined by using the Implicit Function Theorem. Therefore, to prove the effective version, we also need a basic fact about uniformly continuous functions. Recall that a function f is uniformly continuous if

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0 \forall x, y \in \mathrm{dom}(f)(|x - y| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(y)| < \varepsilon).$$

Definition 5.9. Let a, b be rational numbers and let l be a natural number. Given a function $f : (a, b)^l \cap \mathbb{Q}^l \to \mathbb{R}$ define:

$$\psi(f, (a, b)^l) \iff \forall \varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}^+ \exists \delta \in \mathbb{Q}^+ \forall q_1, q_2 \in (a, b)^l \cap \mathbb{Q}^l \\ (|q_1 - q_2| < \delta \implies |f(q_1) - f(q_2)| < \varepsilon).$$

We say that $f : (a, b)^l \cap \mathbb{Q}^l \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-*uniformly continuous* if $\psi(f, (a, b)^l)$ holds.

Remark 5.10. If $f : (a, b)^l \to \mathbb{R}$ is uniformly continuous then $f \restriction (a, b)^l \cap \mathbb{Q}^l$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-uniformly continuous.

Lemma 5.11. *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}$, l be a natural number and let $f : (a, b)^l \cap \mathbb{Q}^l \to \mathbb{R}$ be $\mathbb{Q}$-uniformly continuous.*

- *There exists a Δ^1_1 uniformly continuous function $f^* : (a, b)^l \to \mathbb{R}$ which extends f.*
- *Moreover if $p(x, y)$ is a polynomial such that $\forall q \in (a, b)^l \cap \mathbb{Q}^l (p(q, f(q)) = 0)$, then*

$$\forall r \in (a, b)^l \ (p(r, f^*(r)) = 0).$$

Proof. Define $f^* : (a,b)^l \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows. Let $r \in (a,b)^l$ and let

$$\Big\{q_n \in (a,b)^l \cap \mathbb{Q}^l : n \in \omega\Big\}$$

be such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} q_n = r$. We claim that $\{f(q_n) : n \in \omega\}$ is a Cauchy's sequence. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, we want to prove that there exists N such that for any $n, m > N(|f(q_n) - f(q_m)| < \varepsilon)$. By hypothesis we have

$$\exists \delta \in \mathbb{Q}^+(\forall q_1, q_2 \in (a,b)^l \cap \mathbb{Q}^l(|q_1 - q_2| < \delta \implies |f(q_1) - f(q_2)| < \varepsilon)).$$

Since $\lim_{n\to\infty} q_n = r$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n, m > N(|q_n - q_m| < \delta)$. Therefore $|f(q_n) - f(q_m)| < \varepsilon$ and so $\lim_{n\to\infty} f(q_n) \in \mathbb{R}$. Put $f^*(r) = \lim_{n\to\infty} f(q_n)$. Observe that $f^*(r) = l$ is Σ^1_1 (and so Δ^1_1), indeed:

$$f^*(r) = l \iff \exists q_n \in ((a,b)^l \cap \mathbb{Q}^l)^\omega(\lim_{n\to\infty}(q_n) = r \implies \lim_{n\to\infty} f(q_n) = l),$$

where

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}(x_n) = y \iff \forall \varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}^+ \exists n \in \mathbb{N} \forall m > n(|q_m - l| < \varepsilon).$$

For the second part, let $r \in (a,b)^l$ and let $\Big\{q_n \in (a,b)^l \cap \mathbb{Q}^l : n \in \omega\Big\}$ be such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} q_n = r$. Then

$$p(r, f^*(r)) = p(\lim_{n\to\infty} q_n, \lim_{n\to\infty} f(q_n)) = \lim_{n\to\infty} p(q_n, f(q_n)) = 0. \qquad \square$$

5.3 Definable counterparts

To prove the corresponding Σ^1_2 equivalences with $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$, we first need to consider the counterparts of the definitions of avoidance. The definition of Σ^1_2-avoidance directly follows by the one of avoidance, while we have to be more careful in defining the Σ^1_2 version of m-avoidance.

Definition 5.12. A (k,n)-ary polynomial $p(x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1})$ is Σ^1_2-avoidable if there exists a Σ^1_2 coloring which avoids it.

Definition 5.13. A (k,n)-ary polynomial $p(x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1})$ is (m, Σ^1_2)-avoidable if for each $r \in \mathbb{R} \cap L$, for each $\Sigma^1_2(r)$ function $g : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^n$ which is one-one in each coordinate and for distinct $e_0, \ldots, e_{k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ there is $r' \in \mathbb{R}$ and a coordinately induced $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ which is $\Sigma^1_2(r')$ and such that $p(g\alpha(e_0), \ldots, g\alpha(e_{k-1})) \neq 0$.

Observe that we permit g to be defined with a parameter in $\mathbb{R} \cap L$. To justify this definition recall that in Schmerl's definition g had to be definable.

Theorem 5.14. *If $\mathbb{R} \nsubseteq L$ then every Σ^1_2-avoidable polynomial is $(2, \Sigma^1_2)$-avoidable.*

Proof. Let $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $p(x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1})$ be a (k,n)-ary polynomial which is Σ^1_2-avoidable polynomial. Then there exists a Σ^1_2 coloring $\chi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \omega$ which avoids it. To prove that it is also $(2, \Sigma^1_2)$-avoidable let $r \in \mathbb{R} \cap L$ and consider any $\Sigma^1_2(r)$ function $g : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^n$ (one-one in each coordinate) and any distinct $e_0, \ldots, e_{k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then $\chi \circ g : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \omega$ is also $\Sigma^1_2(r)$. Since $\mathbb{R} \nsubseteq L$, then by applying Proposition 2.3.1, there exist $C = \{c_i : i \in k\}$ and $D = \{d_i : i \in k\}$ such that $\chi \circ g \restriction C \times D$ is monochromatic. Hence define $\alpha_0 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha_1 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by:

$$\alpha_0(x) = y \iff \bigvee_{j\in k}(x = e_j(0) \ \wedge \ y = c_0) \ \vee \ (\bigwedge_{j\in k}(x \neq e_j(0) \ \wedge \ y = x)).$$

$$\alpha_1(x) = y \iff \bigvee_{j\in k}(x = e_j(1) \ \wedge \ y = d_j) \ \vee \ (\bigwedge_{j\in k}(x \neq e_j(1) \ \wedge \ y = x)).$$

Then consider $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\alpha((x,y)) = (\alpha_0(x), \alpha_1(y))$. Since $\alpha(e_j) = (c_0, d_j) \in C \times D$, $\{\chi \circ g \circ \alpha(e_i) : i \in k\}$ is monochromatic. Moreover for any $i \neq j \in k$, $g(\alpha(e_i)) \neq g(\alpha(e_j))$ since g is one-one in each coordinate. Then $p(g(\alpha(e_0)), \dots, g(\alpha(e_{k-1}))) \neq 0$, since χ avoids p. □

The proof of the Σ^1_2 version of Theorem 5.2.2 requires a more elaborated argument, which uses all auxiliary facts listed in Subsection 5.2.

Theorem 5.15. *If $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$ then every $(1, \Sigma^1_2)$-avoidable polynomial is Σ^1_2-avoidable.*

Proof. Let T be a Δ^1_2 transcendence basis of $\mathbb{R}$ over $\mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})$ provided by Lemma 4.4. For any natural number l and any $\overline{q} \in \mathbb{Q}^{2l}$ define $\mathrm{dom}_{\overline{q}} = (q_0, q_1) \times \cdots \times (q_{2l-2}, q_{2l-1})$.

Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $a = \langle a_0 \dots, a_{n-1} \rangle \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $d \in \omega$, $\overline{q} \in \mathbb{Q}^{2l}$ and $f_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{dom}_{\overline{q}} \cap \mathbb{Q}^l}$[1] define $\chi(a, \langle \mathrm{dom}_{\overline{q}}, f_0, \dots, f_{n-1}, d \rangle)$ if and only if there exist $(t_0, \dots, t_{l-1}) \in \mathrm{dom}_{\overline{q}}$ and $p_0, \dots, p_{n-1} \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})[X_0, \dots, X_{l-1}, Y]$ such that

1. $t_0, \dots, t_{l-1} \in T$;
2. $\forall j \in s \exists i \in n (a_i \notin \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})(T \setminus \{t_j\}))$;
3. $d = G(\{t_0, \dots, t_{l-1}\})$, where G is provided by Lemma 5.7;
4. for any $i \in n$ $p_i(t_0, \dots, t_{l-1}, a_i) = 0$;
5. for any $i \in n$ $\psi(f_i, \mathrm{dom}_{\overline{q}})$, i.e. f_i is $\mathbb{Q}$-uniformly continuous (Definition 5.9);
6. for any $i \in n$, $\forall \overline{q}' \in \mathrm{dom}_{\overline{q}} \cap \mathbb{Q}^l p_i(\overline{q}', f_i(\overline{q}'))$.
7. for any $i \in n$, f_i is one-one in each coordinate j such that $a_i \notin \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})(T \setminus \{t_j\})$.

By unfolding definition, χ is Σ^1_2. For any $a = \langle a_0 \dots, a_{n-1} \rangle \in \mathbb{R}^n$, by using Lemma 4.1 there exist $t_0 < \cdots < t_{l-1} \in T$ such that $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})(t_0, \dots, t_{l-1})$. For any $i \in n$, let $p_i \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})[X_0, \dots, X_{l-1}, Y]$ such that $p_i(t_0, \dots, t_{l-1}, a_i) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial y}(t_0, \dots, t_{l-1}, a_i) \neq 0$. Then thanks to the Implicit Function Theorem there exist $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^l$ and $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{f}_i : U \to V$ continuous differentiable such that $(t_0, \dots, t_{l-1}) \in U$ and $\tilde{f}_i(b_0, \dots b_{l-1}) = c$ if and only if $p_i(b_0, \dots, b_{l-1}, c) = 0$. In particular $\tilde{f}_i(t_0, \dots, t_{l-1}) = a_i$. Let $\overline{q} \in \mathbb{Q}^{2l}$ be increasing and such that both $(t_0, \dots, t_{l-1}) \in \mathrm{dom}_{\overline{q}} \subseteq U$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ is one-one in each coordinate j such that $a_i \notin \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})(T \setminus \{t_j\})$. For any $i \in n$, define $f_i = \tilde{f}_i \restriction (\mathrm{dom}_{\overline{q}} \cap \mathbb{Q}^l)$. Hence $\chi(a, \langle \mathrm{dom}_{\overline{q}}, f_0, \dots, f_{n-1}, G(\{t_0, \dots, t_{l-1}\}) \rangle)$. Indeed the functions provided by the Implicit Function Theorem are continuously differentiable and therefore uniformly continuous. By Remark 5.10, f_i is $\mathbb{Q}$-uniformly continuous.

By Σ^1_2 Novikov Kondo Addison Uniformization Theorem (see e.g. [6, 4E4]) there exists a Σ^1_2 function χ^* which uniformizes χ. χ^* has a countable range, since there are countably many polynomials and given $\mathrm{dom}_{\overline{q}}$ and $p_0, \dots, p_{n-1}$ there exists a unique tuple of functions which satisfies the conditions above.

Claim. *The coloring χ^* avoids any $(1, \Sigma^1_2)$-avoidable polynomial.*

Let $p \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})[X_0, \dots, X_{k-1}]$ be a (k,n)-ary polynomial which is not avoided by χ^*. We want to prove that this polynomial is not $(1, \Sigma^1_2)$-avoidable. Let $a^0, \dots, a^{k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be distinct, monochromatic in color $\langle \mathrm{dom}, f_0, \dots, f_{n-1}, d \rangle$, and such that $p(a^0, \dots, a^{k-1}) = 0$.

[1] Note that f_i can be coded as an element in $\mathbb{R}^\omega$.

For each $j \in k$ let $a^j \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})(t_{0,j}, \dots, t_{l-1,j})$, where $t_{i,j} \in (q_{2i}, q_{2i+1})$. For any $i \in n$, let f_i^* be the witness of Lemma 5.11 for f_i and put $f = (f_0^*, \dots, f_{n-1}^*)$. Define $g : (q_{2l-2}, q_{2l-1}) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$g(x) = f(t_{0,0}, \dots, t_{l-2,0}, x).$$

Note that g is Σ_1^1 with parameters in L since $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$. Moreover by (2) and (7) g is injective. For each $j \in k$ put $e_j = t_{l-1,j} \in (q_{l-1}, r_{l-1})$. By Lemma 5.7 they are all distinct. Indeed if there are $j, j' \in k$ such that $e_j = e_{j'}$, since $G(\{t_{0,j}, \dots, t_{l-1,j}\}) = d = G(\{t_{0,j'}, \dots, t_{l-1,j'}\})$, we have for any $i \in l$, $t_{i,j} = t_{i,j'}$. Therefore for any $m \in n$: $a_m^j = f_m(t_{0,j}, \dots, t_{l-1,j}) = f_m(t_{0,j'}, \dots, t_{l-1,j'}) = a_m^{j'}$. To obtain our assertion we need to show that for any $\alpha : (q_{2l-2}, q_{2l-1}) \to (q_{2l-2}, q_{2l-1})$, $p(g(\alpha(e_0)), \dots, g(\alpha(e_{k-1}))) = 0$.

Fix a function α. Let $h : ((q_0, q_1) \times \cdots \times (q_{2l-2}, q_{2l-1}))^k \to \mathbb{R}$ be such that

$$h((y_{0,0} \dots, y_{l-1,0}), \dots, (y_{0,k-1}, \dots, y_{l-1,k-1})) \\ = p(f(y_{0,0}, \dots, y_{l-1,0}), \dots, f(y_{0,k-1}, \dots, y_{l-1,k-1})).$$

And for any $i \in n-1$ put $\beta(t_{0,i}, \dots, t_{l-1,i}) = (t_{0,0}, t_{1,0}, \dots, t_{l-2,0}, \alpha(t_{l-1,i}))$. Then by Lemma 5.8[2], $p(f\beta(t_{0,0}, \dots, t_{l-1,0}), \dots, f\beta(t_{0,k-1}, \dots, t_{l-1,k-1})) = 0$ and

$$p(g\alpha(e_0), \dots, g\alpha(e_{k-1}) = p(g(\alpha(t_{l-1,0})), \dots, g(\alpha(t_{l-1,k-1}))) \\ = p(f\beta(t_{0,0}, \dots, t_{l-1,0}), \dots, f\beta(t_{0,k-1}, \dots, t_{l-1,k-1})) = 0.$$

□

By using Theorem 5.15 we can prove the Σ_2^1 version of the equivalence by Erdős and Komjáth. In order to do that observe that the $(3,2)$-ary polynomial $\tilde{p}(x_0, x_1, x_2)$ we defined in Notation 5.3 is $(1, \Sigma_2^1)$-avoidable and not $(2, \Sigma_2^1)$-avoidable.The proof directly follows the one of Lemma 5.5.

Theorem 5.16. *$\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$ if and only if there exists a Σ_2^1 coloring of the plane with countably many colors with no monochromatic right-angled triangle.*

Proof. "$\Rightarrow$". Assume that $\mathbb{R} \nsubseteq L$. By applying Proposition 2.3.1 for every $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \omega$ Σ_2^1 there exists a monochromatic rectangle and so we are done.

"$\Leftarrow$". Assume that $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$. Recall that $\tilde{p}(x_0, x_1, x_2)$ is $(1, \Sigma_2^1)$-avoidable. By Theorem 5.15 it is Σ_2^1-avoidable. □

To conclude observe that by using the Σ_2^1-version of Erdős-Komjáth equivalence and the properties of $\tilde{p}(x_0, x_1, x_2)$ we can easily prove the vice versa of Theorem 5.14 and of Theorem 5.15 as in Proposition 5.6, therefore we get

Proposition 5.17. *The following are equivalent:*

- $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$;
- *every Σ_2^1-avoidable polynomial is $(2, \Sigma_2^1)$-avoidable;*
- *every $(1, \Sigma_2^1)$-avoidable polynomial is Σ_2^1-avoidable.*

[2]For any $i \in n$, if $f_i(q_0', \dots, q_{l-1}') = x$ then $p(q_0', \dots, q_{l-1}', x) = 0$. It follows $f_i \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})^{\mathrm{dom}_{\overline{q}} \cap \mathbb{Q}^l}$. Hence both f and h are $\mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q})$ definable analytical functions.

6 Open Questions

The arguments presented for Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 4.5 require that the countably many subsets are uniformly definable. This is needed to provide a Σ^1_2 coloring in the proofs of the second implications. Therefore the first natural questions are

Question 6.1. Assume that the set of all real numbers can be decomposed into a countably many (possibly non uniformly) Σ^1_2 definable rationally independent subsets. Does $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$ hold?

Question 6.2. Assume that the set of all transcendental reals is the union of countably many (possibly non uniformly) Σ^1_2 definable algebraically independent subsets. Does $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$ hold?

As observed in Section 4 our definable version of Zoli's equivalence produces countably many algebraically independent subsets which are uniformly Σ^1_2 definable. Therefore we wonder whether $\mathbb{R} \subseteq L$ implies that the set of all transcendental reals is the union of countably many uniformly Σ^1_2 definable transcendence bases. In particular

Question 6.3. Given an algebraically independent subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ which is Δ^1_2 is it possible to define a Δ^1_2 transcendence basis which contains A?

A more general natural question which arises from this work is

Question 6.4. For which inner model does the Σ^1_3 (or the more general Σ^1_n) definable version hold?

By considering the arguments used in the proofs, Question 6.4 can be reformulated as: "which inner model has the perfect set property for Σ^1_n, a Δ^1_n strong well-ordering and Σ^1_n absoluteness?" As suggested by Alessandro Andretta a possible model for Σ^1_{2n} could be the inner model for n-many Woodin cardinals. Anyway, since as far as we know there is not a proof of Mansfield Theorem's analogous for such models, the argument is not straightforward.

Finally, it seems that for any equivalent form of CH is possible to prove its Σ^1_2 definable version. Hence we wonder:

Question 6.5. Is there some general argument which provides, by assuming large cardinal hypotheses, the existence of a proof for the Σ^1_2 corresponding counterpart?

Acknowledgement. I would like to thank Alessandro Andretta for his precious suggestions, remarks and for introducing me to the topic in the first place. I am grateful to Raphaël Carroy for his careful readings, advices and corrections. I am also thankful to the Logic Group of Torino for the patience and the useful comments during my talks.

References

[1] Paul Erdős and Shizuo Kakutani. On non-denumerable graphs. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc*, pages 457–461, 1943.

[2] Paul Erdős and Péter Komjáth. Countable Decompositions of R2 and R3. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 5(4):325–331, 1990.

[3] Akihiro Kanamori. *The higher infinite : large cardinals in set theory from their beginnings*. Perspectives in mathematical logic. Springer-Verlag, 1994.

[4] Péter Komjáth and Vilmos Totik. *Problems and theorems in classical set theory.* Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

[5] Arnold W. Miller. Infinite combinatorics and definability. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 41(2):179 – 203, 1989.

[6] Yiannis N. Moschovakis. *Descriptive set theory.* Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1980.

[7] James H. Schmerl. Countable partitions of euclidean space. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc*, 120:7–12, 1996.

[8] James H. Schmerl. Avoidable algebraic subsets of euclidean space. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 352(6):2479–2489, 1999.

[9] Waclaw Sierpinski. *Cardinal and ordinal numbers.* Panstowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warsaw, second revised edition edition, 1965. Monografie Matematyczne, Vol 34.

[10] Asger Törnquist and William Weiss. Definable Davies' Theorem. *Fund. Math.*, 205(1):77–89, 2009.

[11] Asger Törnquist and William Weiss. The Σ^1_2 counterparts to statements that are equivalent to the continuum hypothesis. 2012. arXiv/1201.0382, to appear in J. Symbolic Logic.

[12] Enrico Zoli. Another algebraic equivalent of the continuum hypothesis. *Tatra Mt. Math. Publ.*, 34(3):223–228, 2006.